



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MAY MEETING, 1891.

THE stated meeting was held on Thursday, the 14th instant, at three o'clock P. M., the President, Dr. GEORGE E. ELLIS, in the chair.

The record of the annual meeting was read and approved; and the Librarian read his monthly list of donors to the Library.

The PRESIDENT, in accordance with the By-Laws, announced the appointment of Rev. Dr. Edward J. Young, Rev. Dr. Alexander McKenzie, and Mr. Charles C. Smith as the Committee for publishing the Proceedings for the ensuing year.

The President presented from Mrs. P. S. L. Canfield, of Worcester, a pair of silver-mounted pistols, which had been given by Commodore Edward Preble to her uncle, the Hon. Enoch Lincoln, on whose death they came into possession of her father, the Hon. Levi Lincoln; and it was voted that the thanks of the Society for this gift should be communicated to Mrs. Canfield by the Recording Secretary.

The PRESIDENT then said: —

Death has removed from the roll of our Corresponding Members the Rev. Edmond de Pressensé, distinguished for talent, learning, and public services in literature and statesmanship. His authorship covered many publications in a wide range of acquisitions in scholarship and political science. We have also lost by death, as I have just been told by Dr. Green, another learned and accomplished Corresponding Member, Thomas Beamish Akins, at one time President of the Nova Scotia Historical Society, who was added to our roll in the same year as Dr. Pressensé.

Our esteemed associate Augustus Thorndike Perkins, who has been a Resident Member of the Society for nearly a score of years, died on the 21st of the last month. His name, with

his lineage and descent, are suggestive of the historic connection of his family with so much that is distinguished and honorable in our community, in social and mercantile life, and in munificent gifts of benevolence. He was himself a gentleman of fine culture and rich accomplishments, with a generous public spirit. We place upon our records our tribute to his noble character and to his valuable service in our aims and work.

Mr. WILLIAM H. WHITMORE, Mr. WILLIAM S. APPLETON, Mr. GEORGE B. CHASE, and Dr. SAMUEL A. GREEN spoke briefly of the character and work of Mr. Perkins; after which Mr. Whitmore was appointed to write a memoir of him for publication in the Proceedings.

Communications from the Third Section having been called for, Mr. R. C. WINTHROP, Jr., said: —

I desire to communicate from the Winthrop Papers two letters of the early Colonial period, one of which possesses a certain sentimental interest, and the other some historical importance. They were both written to Gov. John Winthrop, of Massachusetts; one by the widow of the Rev. Francis Higginson, the other by the Rev. Thomas Hooker. Not long after the last monthly meeting I read with interest a short Life of Francis Higginson, recently prepared by our associate, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, for a series of volumes entitled the "Makers of America"; and the perusal reminded me that some time ago I had identified and deciphered the above-mentioned letter from Francis Higginson's widow. It occurred to me to send a copy of it to Colonel Higginson, and to inquire of him how many of her letters were in existence. He replied that he had never seen one, that he believed them to be excessively rare, and he advised me to communicate this one to the Society. An additional reason for doing so lies in the curious fact that no less than ten of our living Resident Members are descended from this lady. Her husband, as may be remembered, died in the prime of life, in August, 1630, leaving his wife and children in very straitened circumstances. The letter is without date; but the text shows it to have been written in the following spring, — the spring of 1631, — and the purport of it is to

consult the Governor as to her means of livelihood, and, in particular, to inquire upon what terms she was to be permitted to retain two cows which had been temporarily placed at her disposal.¹ Cows were undoubtedly scarce at Salem in 1631; and the Governor indorsed the letter, in his well-known hand, "Mr^s Higginson, about her cow-rents." She was evidently a woman of extreme conscientiousness, as she mentions that some neat's tongues — smoked tongues, I presume — had been found in a barrel of malt sent her, and apprehensive lest they should have been so packed without the knowledge of the donor, she offers to return them, if desired. As she had previously mentioned that her provisions were running low, and as she then had eight children to feed, I cannot but think she would have been amply justified in assuming that these tongues were intended for her use as well as the malt. Indeed, I doubt whether there is a single one of our ten living members descended from her who, under similar circumstances, would not have proceeded to consume them without saying anything about it.

The second letter I have to communicate is also without date; but the contents clearly establish that it was written by Hooker soon after his return to Hartford, in the autumn of 1637, after his attendance on the memorable Synod held in Cambridge to condemn the doctrines of Mrs. Hutchinson, of which he was one of the moderators. The question may naturally be asked, why this letter was not included with several others from Hooker found among the Winthrop Papers, and printed by this Society nearly thirty years ago. The answer is, that it is so torn and defaced that it was long considered impossible to decipher enough of it to make it worth publishing. Since the last meeting, however, I was applied to by the Rev. G. L. Walker, D.D., of Hartford, who is engaged on a Life of Hooker for the series of "Makers of America," above mentioned, and who wished me to examine the original of one of Hooker's letters already printed, in order to clear up a discrepancy between the indorsement and the date. I found that a former publishing-committee of ours had been caught napping, although the blame is chiefly Thomas Hook-

¹ Felt, in the appendix to the first edition of his "Annals of Salem," mentions her writing to Governor Winthrop, in January of the same year, to thank him for the use of these cows.

er's, who carelessly made a "3" look like a "2."¹ This led me again to attack the illegible letter, and by gradually wetting parts of it and patiently applying a powerful magnifying-glass, I eventually succeeded in deciphering all but about nine words, which are so scattered that their absence does not obscure the sense of any passage. The letter proves to be both of interest and importance, containing a striking sentence in which Hooker declares his determination, in cases of difficulty, to be guided by no evidence which would not satisfy an impartial judge. In these days, when so many historical writers seem more and more bent upon making their facts fit in to preconceived opinions, it is, I think, refreshing to come across a historical personage of two centuries and a half ago who at the moment of a bitter controversy seems to have been animated by a love of truth.

ANNE HIGGINSON TO JOHN WINTHROP.

WORTHY S^r—My love and service to yo^u remembred, wishing yo^r health and pperity in the Lord. The cause of my writtinge at this time is to give yo^u notice how it is wth me. I have 10 ackers of ground to inclose, and it lieth soe among others ground that I must inclose it or forgoe it. Now I am destitute of helth and meñes to doe it, having noe man. Therfore I doe desire yo^r advise in it. Allsoe the time cometh on to sett corne, & if soe be yo^u wth the rest will alow me a man, as my husband's condition was, I should be glad to understand your pleasure in it. And further, as for the howse I now live in, I doe daly expect when they will call for mony for it. Now my desire is to knowe whether yo^u will build me one or pay for y^t I am in. I shall be content wth what you thinke fitt; only my desire is to know w^{ch} you will doe, and I doe earnestly entreat yo^r Wor^{sh}, wth y^e rest of the gentlemen, to know what yo^u intend to doe for the time to come. My pvisions grows skaut, though I husband them the best I cañe. Allsoe concerning the kine, my desire is to know how longe I shall have them and whether I shall have half the increase, as was before agreed upon by the marchants. Soe S^r once more I pray you to send mee word what you intend to doe. In my barrell of mault I found some neatts tongs; if you please, I will send you y^m wth the first messenger I can. Soe I beseech the Lord to bless yo^u and rest

Yo^r ffrend to her power,

ANNE HIGGISON.

¹ See 4 Mass. Hist. Coll., vi. (Winthrop Papers, part i.) p. 390, where both the subject of the letter and Governor Winthrop's clearly legible indorsement show that it must have been written in 1643.

THOMAS HOOKER TO JOHN WINTHROP.

To the right worship John Wynthropp, Esquier, Governour in Matheshusetts, dd.

RIGHT WORSHIP: & MUCH HONORED IN OUR BLESSED SAVIOUR,

By returne of our speciall freinds I could not but returne a thankfull acknowledgment of all your former kyndnesses & your last loving entertaynement, & also to give you an account of such businesses wch were in part comended to our care touching the ripening of such passages of the Synod wch were of wayt & worthy record & consideration. You may be pleased therefore to understand y^t M^r Higginson,¹ who was the scribe in Assembly, hath imployd his tyme, since his coming, to transcribe such things wch were of use; but because the things were many & his tyme short, our freinds returning so speedily, he could not accomplish much, but hath taken his papers wth him downe to the mouth of y^e river, whither his occasions call him for the p^sent & from whence he will send you such p^ticulars as he shall shortly write out, & y^t by the soonest conveyance. The good Lord prosper these begynings for the settling of peace & truth wth you in all his Churches. I daily regret many stratagems of Satan to be plotted & practised. All y^t I would crave leave to p^sent to your judicious apprehension is this in short. I have ever judged it, in cases of difficulty wch must come to scanning, most safe to attend nothing for ground of determination, but y^t wch will cary an undeniable evidence to an im^ptiall judge. He y^t desires multitude of arguments to cary a cause, & therefore [*four or five words torn*] the weaknes of some [*three words torn*] y^e wayt of y^e rest. For execution, let it be so secret & suddayne y^t it cannot be p^rvented, so resolute & [*one word illegible*] y^t it may take off hope frō the adversary y^t it can be respyted; & this damps opposition & p^rvents hazard. Men will not attempt resistance when ther is no opportunity to attayne what they do attempt; whereas opennes & fayntnes of resolution provokes men to oppose & to adventure upon hazard in opposition. You will not be offended y^t I shot my bolts; your loving acceptance adds encouragement in this kynd. The Lord steare your course for you & give a blessing to all your indeavors & godly proceedings. So he wisheth who rests in all thankfulnes

Yrs in all due respect,

T. HOOKER.

The Rev. Dr. EGBERT C. SMYTH presented an additional letter from Col. John Stoddard, supplementing the papers relating to the building of Fort Dummer which were communicated by him at the March meeting. The letter is without superscription, but was evidently written to Capt. Timothy Dwight.

¹ Rev. John Higginson, then of Saybrook.

NTH HAMPTON Feby 14 172³.

S^r — I receiv^d yours last night. the Mounts (if thought to small) may be enlarged, but my Inclination remains for Shingling with Spruce as to the manner of laying them I am not so Curious.

I was thoughtful that when the Carpenters returned they would encline to spend a week at Home, which I am not averse to, for I think we shall be forward enough in our work, however you may doe as you think fit, when the fort is set up I believe it must not be wholly left, the Lieut^{nt} Gov^r is concerned how we can in the frost lay a foundation of Stone, and build Cellar Walls, but I suppose that Objection may be obviated. if you think fit to take a breathing spell as I propose above, you may take that Opportunity to come hither and receive your Commission, together with Searl^s Commission, as also what money I have receiv^d for Provisions, which is two-Hundred Pounds, that the Treasurer hath already sent.

your Humble Servant JOHN STODDARD.

Dr. SAMUEL A. GREEN made the following remarks :—

At the last May meeting I communicated some papers relating to Capt. Thomas Lawrence's company, raised in Groton for the campaign of 1758 during the French and Indian War, which were published in the Proceedings. As supplementary to those papers, I wish now to present "A Return of Men Inlisted for his Majesty's Service for the Totall Reduction of Canada 1760." The men were enlisted by Capt. Thomas Farrington, who raised a company in Groton and neighborhood, which served during the campaign of 1760. His command is referred to in Sergeant David Holden's Journal, printed in the Proceedings for June, 1889. In the copy herewith given I have omitted some of the headings; such as "When Inlisted," "By whome," and "What Regiment." With the exception of James Frye and Philip Barker, both of Andover, who joined a company in Colonel Osgood's command, they were all enlisted in the regiment of Col. William Lawrence, of Groton. The date of enlistment extended over a period from February 14 to April 9, 1760. "Barzzealer" [Barzillai] Lew, son of Primus, was a negro, and belonged to a well-known colored family of that day, somewhat noted for their musical attainments. In early times the sturdy yeomanry of Massachusetts often stood in the ranks shoulder to shoulder with the black soldier; and it was never thought that this juxtaposition lowered their dignity, nor did

it create a ripple in the mind of any man. It will be noticed that, in the case of minors, the names of parents or guardians are also given. The surnames Kemp and Kendall are written "Kimp" and "Kindall," showing how the words were then generally pronounced.

The "Return" is found on two separate sheets, and the indorsement on each sheet by the mustering-officers is also given.

*A Return of Men Inlisted for his Majesty's Service for the Totall
Reduction of Cannada 1760.*

| Men's Names | Whear born | Whear Resedant | Age | Names of Fathers of son under age and Masters of Servants |
|-----------------------------|------------|----------------|-----|---|
| Silous Kimp | Groton | Groton | 18 | Hezekiah Kimp |
| Sampson Blood | D° | D° | 27 | |
| Abijah Parker | D° | D° | 17 | the Scelectmen |
| Lemuel Ames | D° | D° | 17 | William Lawrance |
| Zachreah Parker | D° | D° | 21 | |
| John Gragg | D° | D° | 19 | Jacob Gragg |
| Aaron Blood | D° | D° | 21 | |
| Joseph Page | D° | D° | 20 | Joseph Page |
| John Boyden | D° | D° | 25 | |
| Stephen Pirce | D° | D° | 21 | |
| James Fisk | D° | D° | 22 | |
| Joseph Gillson | D° | D° | 21 | |
| William Parker | D° | D° | 19 | William Parker |
| Nathaniel Green | D° | D° | 18 | William Green |
| Hezekiah Kimp | D° | D° | 22 | |
| Robert Blood | Pepperall | Pepperall | 25 | |
| John Trowbridge | Groton | Groton | 21 | |
| John Erwin Ju? | D° | D° | 21 | |
| John Erwin | D° | D° | 42 | |
| Andrew McFarland | D° | D° | 18 | Margrat McFarland |
| Abel Kimp | D° | D° | 17 | Hezekiah Kimp |
| Oliver Hartwill | D° | D° | 20 | Scelectmen |
| Jon ^s Boyden | D° | D° | 17 | Josiah Boyden |
| Josiah Blood | D° | Pepperall | 18 | John Shattuck |
| Abijah Warren | Weston | Groton | 22 | |
| William Hubart | D° | Pepperall | 18 | Sheb ^l Hubart |
| Ebenez ^r Nutting | Groton | Groton | 17 | Tho ^r Farrington |
| James Frye | Andover | Andover | 20 | Co ^l James Frye |
| Philip Barker | Dover | D° | 19 | Isaac Blunt |
| Isaac Nutting | Groton | Groton | 21 | |
| William Lasley | D° | D° | 18 | Robert Parker |
| Jonathan Holden | D° | D° | 24 | |
| Ruben Woods | D° | D° | 18 | Ruben Woods |

MIDDLESSEX s^s March 6th 1760 I Certifye that Twenty one of the first within Named on the other Side of this with Roll was Mustred by me this Day and that they ware Inlisted at the Time Set against Each of there Names and that ware Duley attested before me

⌘ WILLIAM LAWRANCE { *Col^o & Commissary of Musters*
and Justice of the Peace

MIDDLESEX s^s March 10th 1760 I Certifye that Oliver Hartwill Jonathan Boyden Josiah Blood Named on the other Side of the within Roll was Mustred by me this Tenth Day of March and Abijah Warren within Named was Mustred on March the Ninth and they ware all Inlisted at the Time Set against Each of thiere Names and was attested by James Prescott Esq^r

⌘ JOHN BULKLEY L^t *Co^l & Commissary of Musters*

MIDDLESEX s^s April 9th 1760 I Certifye that William Hubart Named on the other Side of this within Roll was Mustred by me on the fifth Day of April and Ebenezer Nutting Named on this Roll was Mustred by me on April the Ninth and they ware Inlisted at the Time Set against Each of their Name on the with Roll and that they ware Duley attested before me

⌘ WILLIAM LAWRANCE { *Co^l & Commisary of Musters*
and Justice of the Peace

ESSEX s^s Andover March 3rd 1760 I Certifye that James Frye and Philip Barker Named on the other Side of this within Roll was Mustred by me this Day and that they ware Inlisted at the Time Set agianst Each of thire Names and was Duley attested be John Osgood Esq^r and Sam^l Philips Esq^r

⌘ JOHN OSGOOD *Co^l and Commiserey of Musters*

MIDDLESEX s^s March 25th 1760 I Certifye that Isaac Nutting William Lasley Jonathan Holden and Ruben Woods Named on the other Side of this within Roll was Mustered by me this Day and that they ware Inlisted at the Time Set against Each of there Names and that they all Duley attested before James Prescott Esq^r

JOHN BULKLEY L^t *Co^l & Commissary of Musters*

*A Return of Men Inlisted for his Majesty's Service for the Total
Reduction of Canada 1760*

| Men's Names | Where born | Where Resedant | Age | Names of Fathers of son under age and Masters of Servants |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------|-----|---|
| William Brown | Ireland | Stow | 31 | |
| Obidiah Perry | Weston | Groton | 35 | |
| Josiah Stevens | Townshend | D ^o | 18 | Martha Stevens |
| David Sartill | Groton | D ^o | 33 | |
| Moses Keazer | Haverall | Groton | 45 | |
| John Archerbill | Groton | D ^o | 18 | John Archerble |
| William Pirce | D ^o | D ^o | 17 | Elijah Rockwood |
| Joseph Parker | D ^o | D ^o | 16 | Ephream Ware |
| Jonas Nutting | D ^o | D ^o | 16 | Scelectmen |
| Joshua Pirce | Weston | D ^o | 18 | Jonas Stone |
| Benj ^a Willson | Groton | Townshend | 19 | Benj ^a Wilson |
| Nathan Harrington | Lexenton | Shirley | 19 | Richard Harrington |
| John Farnsworth | N ^o 4 | Groton | 18 | David Farnsworth |
| William Farwill | Groton | D ^o | 17 | Olever Farwill |
| Richard Sartill | D ^o | D ^o | 22 | |
| William Stevens | Stow | Stow | 29 | |
| Jabez Kindall | Groton | Pepperall | 18 | Jabez Kindel |
| Ephream Kimp | D ^o | Groton | 18 | Sam ^l Kimp |
| Ebn ^t Woods | D ^o | Peprall | 31 | |
| Josiah Fish | D ^o | D ^o | 26 | |
| Oliver Shead | D ^o | D ^o | 21 | |
| William Shead | D ^o | D ^o | 22 | |
| William Farnsworth | D ^o | D ^o | 22 | |
| Jonathan Williames | Peprall | D ^o | 22 | |
| Lemuel Patt | Townshend | D ^o | 18 | John Patt |
| John Avery | D ^o | D ^o | 17 | Edmand Bancroft |
| Barzzealer Lew | Groton | D ^o | 18 | Primous Lew |
| Oliver Elliott | D ^o | D ^o | 24 | |
| Henery Willord | Lancaster | D ^o | 30 | |
| Solomon Parker | Suresbury | Groton | 17 | Simon Parker |
| Peter Gillson | Groton | D ^o | 27 | |
| Abner Turner | Lancaster | D ^o | 16 | Eliab Turner |
| James Lasley | Groton | Pepperall | 25 | |
| Benj ^a Rolf | D ^o | D ^o | 18 | Benj ^a Rolf |
| Stephen Gates | Canterbuary | Littleton | 17 | Stephen Gates |

MIDDLESX s^e March 10th 1760 I Certifye that the Sixteen first Born
on the other Side of this within Roll was Mustered by me this Day
and that they ware Inlisted at the Time Set against Each of there
Names and that they ware Duley attested before James Prescott Esq^r

¶ JOHN BULKLEY Lt Col^l & Commissary of Musters

MIDDLESEX s^s March 15th 1760 I Certifye that William Stevens Jabez Kindel and Ephream Kimp Named on the other Side of this Roll was Mustered by me this Day and that they ware Inlisted at the Time Set against Each of Names, and that they ware Duley attested before James Prescott Esq^r

¶ JOHN BULKLEY L^t Co^l and Commissary of Musters

MIDDLESX s^s March 10th 1760 I Certifye that Eben^r Woods Josiah Fish Oliver Shead William Shead William Farnsworth Jonathan Williams Lemuel Patt John Avery Barzzela Lew Named on the other Side of this Roll was Mustred by me this Tenth Day of March and Oliver Elliott was Mustred on the Eigteenth Day of Said March and Henery Willord was Mustred on March 29th they all are Born on the other Side of this Roll and was Inlisted at the Time Set against Each of there Names and that ware attested by James Prescott Esq^r

¶ JOHN BULKLEY L^t Co^l and Commissary of Musters

MIDDLEX s^s April 10th [1760] I Certifye that Solomon Parker Named on the other Side of this within Roll was Mustred on April the Ninth and Peter Gillson and Abner Turner was Mustred on the Tenth Instant they are all borne on the other Side of this within Roll and was Inlisted at the Time Set aganst Each of there Names in Said Roll as have been Duley attested

¶ WILLIAM LAWRENCE { Co^l & Commiseray of Mustrs
and Justice of Peace

MIDDESSEX ss March 6th 1760 I Certifye that Benj^a Rolf and James Lasley Named on the other Side of this within Roll was Mustered by Me this Day and that they ware Inlisted at the Time Set against Each of their Names on the Roll afore Said and has been Duley attested

WILLIAM LAWRENCE Co^l & Commissary of Muster
and Justice of the Peace

I wish also to present a "List" of men that were ordered out in July, 1748, under the command of Capt. Samuel Tarbell, to scout for Indians in the neighborhood of Groton. At that time there was an alarm among the inhabitants of the town, caused by the appearance of the Indians at Lunenburg, and another Groton company also went out for the same purpose under Capt. Thomas Tarbell, a brother of Samuel; but they did not find the enemy. For a list of Thomas's company, see "Groton during the Indian Wars" (pages 154, 155).

A List of The Names of the men that ware ordered oute on a Scoute after the Enemy with me the Subscriber, by Major Lawrence — on y^e. 28 — Day of July last Round Part of Townshend and Luenburg — &c

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|--------------------|--------|
| Jonathan Bancroft | 3 days | Jonathan Crese | 2 days |
| Jonathan Farewell | 3 days | Eleazer Tarbell | 3 days |
| Nathan fish | 3 days | Nathanil Smith | 3 days |
| Ebenezer Sprague | 3 days | Hezekiah Patterson | 3 days |
| Caleb Holdin | 3 days | Benjamin Davis | 2 days |
| Amos Holdin | 3 days | Samuel Nickols | 2 days |
| Jacob Ames | 2 days | Jonathan Sawtell | 3 days |
| Jonathan Nutting | 3 days | Oliver Farnsworth | 3 days |
| Jonathan Page Ju ^r | 3 days | Moses Wentworth | 3 days |
| Jonathan Bennet | 3 days | John Sawtell | 3 days |
| Aaron Farnsworth | 3 days | Scripture frost | 2 days |
| Thomas Laughton | 2 days | Jonathan Smith | 3 days |
| Elisha Rockwood | 2 days | Simeon Green | 3 days |
| Joshua Tod | 2 days | Zechariah Longley | 3 days |
| | | <hr/> | |
| | | 38 | |
| 38 | | 38 | |

SAM^{LL} TARBELL Capt 3

@ 2/ 7 day 7 : 18.0 79 days

11 w : 2d

MIDD^s ss December 19th 1748

then the aboue named Cap^t Samuel Tarbell appeared and made oth that the aboue is a Just and true List of the men and time as aboue mentioned before me
WILLIAM LAWRENCE Justice of Peace

| | | |
|--|----------|------------------|
| 76 @ 2/6 | 9 : 10 0 | |
| Cap ^t Tarbell 3 days | 9 6 | |
| | <hr/> | |
| | 9 19 6 | 9.19.6 |
| Eleazer Tarbell & James Shattuck omitted in a } former Roll Each 17/6 | | 1.15 0 |
| | | <hr/> |
| | | £ 11 : 14 : 6 |

Ex[aminéd]

Alow'd by the Comd^t J OSBORNE 7 J CHANDLER

this may Certifie whome it may Consarn that whareas the Inden Enemy in July Last Came to Lunenburg in the County of Worcester and the People there and in the neighbouring towns being there by Putt in to

Grate Destress they haueing haueing [*sic*] but a fue soulders and maney of the Inhabitance Dayly Drawing of & as Co^l Willard had Left this affair of my town with me I ordered the Capt within mentioned and men to Purform a scoute as within mentioned

WILLIAM LAWRENCE

GROTON December 19th 1748:

[Indorsed "Cap^t Tarbell Scout July 1748

Warr^t advis'd Jan^y 3. 1748"]

During this alarm the Indians made an attack on the house of John Fitch, then situated in that part of Lunenburg afterward called Fitchburg, but by a later act of incorporation included within the limits of Ashby, when they burned his dwelling, and carried him and his family into captivity, where they remained one year. Mr. Fitch was a resident of Fitchburg when it was incorporated, and the new town took its name from him. In Torrey's History of Fitchburg (page 46), the date of the assault is given wrong, as is shown by the following extract from "The Boston Weekly News-Letter," July 14, 1748:—

Last Tuesday was sev'night [July 5] about 30 or 40 of the Enemy, came upon a garrison'd House at the Out-skirts of Lunenburgh, and two Soldiers posted there were both kill'd near the Garrison, one being knock'd on the Head, the other shot thro' the Body, as he was endeavouring to escape. The Master of the House, Mr. John Fitch, 'tis tho't was siez'd by them in the Field, as he was spreading Hay, and his Wife as she was bringing Water from a Spring, about 20 Rods Distance, a Pail and her Bonnet being found near the Path: The House they set on Fire and burnt it to the Ground, and the Body of of [*sic*] one of the slain Soldiers lay so near thereto, that the Head was burnt from the Shoulders. The neighbouring Towns being soon alarm'd, above 40 Men muster'd and got upon the Spot before Sundown, but the Enemy had withdrawn; however they kept a strict Watch and Guard all Night, and just about the Dawn of the next Day they heard a Noise among the Bushes, which they suppos'd to be some of the Enemy that were left as Spies, who perceiving the Number that came against them, skulk'd away without being discover'd: Mr. Fitch, his Wife and 5 Children being missing, 'tis concluded they were taken Prisoners by the Enemy. The Bodies of the two Soldiers were found and buried.

Last Thursday a Man at Lunenbourg, was way-laid and shot at by some Indians, as was also another at Township No. 2 [Westminster]. but both happily escap'd.

The Hon. MELLEN CHAMBERLAIN said that within a few years there had come to light much interesting and some historically important information respecting a group of young men who followed the British flag to Boston in the summer of 1774, in the attempt by the mother country to reduce the colonies to imperial subjection.

The first was a series of letters written from Boston or New York, in 1774-1776, by Capt. W. Glanville Evelyn, a copy of which is in the library. Captain Evelyn, of the same family as the author of "Sylva," was in the famous Fourth Regiment, "The King's Own," and participated in the affairs at Lexington and Bunker Hill. He was mortally wounded in the skirmish at Throg's Neck, Oct. 18, 1776, and died November 6. Captain Cochrane was one of the executors of his will.

Of similar interest was a collection of original letters of Lord Percy written about the same time, and now in the Boston Public Library.

But the most valuable was a memorial of his military career prepared by Capt. Charles Cochrane, who was with the main army from its arrival at Boston, in 1774, or with Clinton or Cornwallis in their Southern campaigns, till his death at Yorktown, Oct. 17, 1781.

Captain Cochrane was of the Scottish family of that name, in which was the Earldom of Dundonald, whose personal histories filled some space in the public eye in the fifty years included in the last quarter of the eighteenth and the first quarter of the nineteenth century. He was the next younger brother of Archibald, the ninth Earl of Dundonald, who after some service in the army and navy succeeded to the earldom on the death of his father, in 1778, and thereafter gave his attention to scientific pursuits, in which he made some discoveries more profitable to his country than to himself, and died in poverty, July 1, 1831.

Captain Cochrane's youngest brother, Sir Alexander Forrester Inglis, K. C. B., Admiral of the Blue in 1819, gained great distinction with Rodney in the West Indies, and with Lord Keith and Sir Ralph Allen in Egypt in 1801. He was unpleasantly known in America as commander of the British fleet about Chesapeake Bay in the War of 1812, and he assisted the land forces in the attack on New Orleans in 1815.

Other members of the family became known in various fields

of activity, but none more so than Captain Cochrane's nephew, Thomas, Lord Cochrane, the tenth Earl of Dundonald, whose long and varied career in Europe and in South America needs no recital here.

Hon. Charles Cochrane, whose memorial will be presently laid before the Society, was born Jan. 23, 1749. He was an ensign in the Twenty-fifth Regiment for six years; and for the same time, from 1768, a lieutenant in the Seventh Regiment of Foot. On April 17, 1774, he embarked for Boston as the youngest captain in "The King's Own," — Captain Evelyn, above mentioned, being the next older. It was a detachment of this regiment that, on the request of the loyalists of Plymouth County, was sent to Marshfield, Jan. 23, 1775, to protect the members of the "Loyal Association," in the formation of which Timothy Ruggles took a prominent part. The detachment was recalled to Boston soon after the hostilities at Lexington. Captain Cochrane's services between 1774 and his death in October, 1781, are fully set forth in the account which he gives of them in the following memorial.

Captain Cochrane's memorial, which is without date, address, signature, or heading, appears to be an office copy of the original made for the head of the department to which the subject of it belonged, and in this case presumably, Lord George Germaine.

In the beginning of 1774 Capt. Cochrane purchased a company, and went abroad to America as Captain in the 4th Regiment.

He was employed by Lord Percy as one of the officers he sent privately the evening before the affair of Lexington upon a very trying service, and during the following day Captain Cochrane had much to do in assisting his father in law Major Pitcairn, who was after killed in the action of Bunker's Hill.

Captain Cochrane was then appointed to the Grenadier Company upon Capt. West being wounded and going to England.¹

On the 29th Aug^t 1776, having the oldest company of Grenadiers in the army and consequently being on the right of that corps, he was so situated as to endeavour to take an active part. His company went particularly close to the rebel lines, and were with difficulty restrained from being in them.²

¹ He was wounded at Bunker Hill, June 17.

² Captain Evelyn's account of this affair is as follows: "The next day, a few companies of Light Infantry were prompted to attack a party of the rebels, and

Until the 28th Sep^r, the affair of White Plains, he continued to serve in the Grenadiers. Capt. West returning about that time from England, and Capt. Evelyn of the Light Infantry being killed, he resigned the Grenadiers to their former captain, and took the command of the vacant Light Company, which he had the honor to command from that time until the embarkation of the 4th Regiment for the West Indies in 1778.

His company was present on every service, and the active part they ever took in the moment of action is known to his superior officers and coetemporaries.

After many losses during the winter's duty at Brunswick in 1778 his company in the action at Brandywine lost an officer and 11 men in forcing that part of the rebel line where their five field pieces were.

In the action of Germantown he lost an officer and 5 men; during this day being joined by the 42^d Light Company and half of the 17th, he had the fortune to meet the 9th Virginia Regiment which had penetrated through the British line, and were pillaging the wigwams of the 4th & 42^d Light Companies when they were attacked and totally destroyed by the above two companies and a half.¹

This campaign his company had 2 officers & 22 men killed or wounded.

At Philadelphia in 1778, having been six years an ensign, six a lieutenant, and near five a captain,

He memorialled Sir William Howe to be permitted to purchase (if no senior captain in the regiment would) the majority of the 4th Regiment, expected soon to be vacant by the intended promotion of Major Balfour to the Lieut. Colonelcy of the 23^d Regim^t.

Captain Cochrane had not the happiness to be permitted, and Sir James Murray rather, — an older captain, but not near so long in the service, — was put over his head as Major into the 4th Regiment.

Hurt by his want of success or interest to effectuate his preferment, and desirous to obtain it in any way, he soon after consented to exchange his company for a lieutenancy in the 1st Guards, an exchange which has been attended with much expence to him, and was permitted to serve in America as Major of the British Legion which Sir Henry Clinton had about that time honoured him with.

In this corps he has continued to serve ever since, particularly inspecting the infantry of it.

with more ardour than discretion, pushed them to their very lines, where they were supported by their cannon." — *Letters*, p. 85.

¹ "The Americans attacked this post on the morning of the 4th October, and drove in the piquets of the right wing. The Fourth were moved forward to support the light infantry, and the assault was sustained with such determined bravery, that the enemy could make no impression at this point of attack." — *Historical Record of the Fourth Regiment*, p. 70.

He was the first who introduced into the army the species of service of mounted light infantry, a kind of corps theretofore unknown, though the subsequent advantages have been found from much experience to answer the fullest expectations.

The cavalry and infantry of the Legion has ever moved together, and have gone with confidence any distance from the main army when mutually supporting one another.

Zealous for the honor of the corps and to promote the service, the infantry have cheerfully often rode eighty miles in twenty four hours without either bridle or saddle, and only a blanket and piece of rope substituted as bridle, assisting their cavalry to surprize and beat the enemy.

With confidence Capt. Cochrane may say that no cavalry can or has acted in America until the co-operation of mounted infantry was introduced with them, and that upon every occasion the infantry of the Legion have bore an ample share of either fatigue or honor in all actions since the formation of the corps, which the following extracts from public orders and instances of their conduct will testify.

CHARLES TOWN, 12th May, 1780.

Copy of Sir Henry Clinton's thanks to the army, and particularly to Lieutenant Colonel Tarleton and the corps of cavalry.

And to the infantry of the Legion for their soldierlike conduct and gallantry which gives them such brilliant advantage over the enemy.

CAMPDEN, June 1st

Orders. Lord Cornwallis desires that Lieut^t Colonel Tarleton, Major Cochrane, and the officers and soldiers of the Legion and detachment serving with them, will accept of his warmest acknowledgments for the splendid services they have rendered their country by the gallant action of the 29th of May.

The rapidity of their march and the vigour of their attack will ever reflect the highest honour on them, the brilliant success will be a memorable proof of the undaunted courage of the soldiers, and the distinguished abilities of the officers by whom they were commanded.¹

In February, 1779, the infantry had the pleasure to execute Sir William Erskine's orders with success in protecting some government vessells at Sagg Harbour when attacked by a formidable rebel fleet, and even took from them a new continental brig of sixteen six pounders, which is now a sloop of war in his Majesty's service.

¹ Captain Cochrane's statement is confirmed by General Greene in a letter to General Steuben, Feb. 15, 1781: "Cornwallis's movements are so rapid, that few or no militia join us. He marches from 20 to 30 miles in a day; and is organized to move with the same facility as a light infantry corps. Should he continue to push us, we must be finally ruined without reinforcements." — GORDON, vol. iv. p. 46.

In the surprize of the rebel Dragoons at Monk's Corner this campaign, by dismounting the infantry when in the village, we were enabled to attack the rebels when they defended their houses at night, and pursue those who attempted to escape.

Major Vernier of the rebel Legion and many others suffered from this sort of service.

During the blockade of Charlestown a number of sloops and schooners having been taken on the Wardoo River by the Legion infantry, with the approbation of the Commander in Chief, they fitted these vessels up with 18 pounders and manned them, and were the means of compleating the difficulties thrown in the way of the rebels escaping by Cooper or Wardoo Rivers.

In the action of Lenew's Ferry the 6th of May, where Lieut! Colonel Tarleton (as he has ever done) gained much honorable advantage over the rebels, the mounted infantry were up, and pursued the rebel Dragoons into the swamp, destroying many of them in it, and the Santee River.

After the surrender of Charlestown a large body of rebels were endeavouring to retire by the back parts of the Province, and being far ahead of Lord Cornwallis's corps, his Lordship the 27th of May detached Lieut! Colonel Tarleton & Major Cochrane with the cavalry and infantry of the Legion with directions to harrass and impede their retreat as much as possible.

The infantry, though not half mounted, then got all to Campden in two days, which is 60 miles, and it being necessary to push the rebels without loss of time, Colonel Beaufort having got three days march a head, the whole corps moved at 2 o'clock the following morning, though two companies were not then compleated with horses, they were however mounted before they marched 20 miles, and except the guard left with their 3 pounders the infantry of the Legion were fortunately up at the moment of attacking the rebels at Waxaw.

Their conduct on this occasion, and the part they contributed towards the success of the day was as much as men could do.

The advantages resulting from having infantry up will appear from the opinions and conduct of the rebel officers at the commencement of this action.

While Capt. Cochrane was dismounting and forming the infantry opposite the rebel centre, he heard a rebel officer upon the right call to his men, —

"Be cool and take care what they were about, that it was only a few light horse, and they would give a good account of them."

He was answered by another officer upon the left: —

"He was mistaken, he was mistaken; do you see here, there is infantry."

On this occasion the infantry never fired a shot, but used their bayonets, and had two valuable officers killed.

By Capt. Ross, Lord Cornwallis's aid de camp, he is informed, on every occasion since Capt. Cochrane quitted them they have behaved with equal spirit.

The very considerable loss they have sustained this campaign in officers will testify the particular share they have had in every enterprize, having from the 29th of May had 1 capt. 3 lieut^s killed & 2 lieut^s wounded, making near half the loss of the whole army employed there.

After the action at Waxaw the campaign not being expected to commence again before the month of October or November, as Capt. Cochrane had not been in England for near seven years and having a family there to attend to, he thought the then respite a favorable opportunity to visit them, intending to return to America as soon as he could settle his private affairs, which it became necessary for him to attend to, having his father in law Major Pitcairn killed in America, and his father Lord Dundonald dead at home since his serving in that country.

He therefore made application to Lord Cornwallis at Campden for his permission to go to England, and was honored with the annexed testimony of his Lordships approbation.

CAMPDEN, June 10th, 1780.

DEAR SIR, — I cannot let you go from hence without expressing the very sincere regret I feel at your leaving my corps, and assuring you that on any future occasion I shall be happy in serving with so able and spirited an officer. I heartily wish you a prosperous voyage, and a happy meeting with your family, and am with great regard,

Your most obedient and faithful servant,

CORNWALLIS.

HONBLE MAJOR COCHRANE.

Capt. Cochrane repaired to New York, where he was further favored with the Commander in Chief's permission and confidence, and was entrusted with his Excellency's dispatches for Government with which he was endeavouring to get to England in a small schooner of his own, when attacked at sea the 16th of August by three rebel privateers; he only then saved himself by securing the men sent to board his schooner and sinking their boats, after delivering the prisoners he had taken at New York; in proceeding up the Sound he was again attacked by two rebel privateers from New England shore, and after a resistance of near 3 hours within sight of a British man of war and not more than a league from her, was obliged to abandon his schooner and swim a shore to save his dispatches, leaving every other thing.

Capt. Cochrane has been now upwards of eighteen years in the army, has hardly ever been absent from his regiment or service during that time.

He has purchased every commission, and what he at present holds has been attended with particular expense to him.

Almost every cotemporary has acquired the rank of lieutenant colonel before him, the only rank which gives an officer a chance of command and an opportunity of exerting himself when fit for service.

He humbly hopes your Lordship will be pleased to take his services and case into consideration and grant him the honor of your Lordship's countenance in obtaining advancement in his profession.

Proposals by the Honorable Captain Cochrane for raising a new Corps in America.

Captain Cochrane has been in the army upwards of eighteen years, during which time he has hardly ever been absent from his duty or service, and has acted for some years past as Major of the British Legion in America.

Before his departure from New York, Sir Henry Clinton was pleased to express a desire of serving Captain Cochrane. He therefore solicited his Excellency's countenance to his raising a new corps or second battalion to the British Legion.

Sir Henry Clinton was pleased to signify his approbation, and to say, that if it hereafter takes place he wishes to annex to whatever corps Captain Cochrane raises a body of men to the number of 300^d who shall be ready to man the flat boats for transporting the army, the armed vessels for covering their landing or guarding the inland navigation and carry intelligence from one Province to another.

His Excellency was pleased to refer Captain Cochrane to General Dalrymple, who would digest such a proposal for the good of the service.

The following advantages might be expected to attend such an establishment.

It will bring into our service a number of maritime and other people who have heretofore been averse to take the ostensible part of fighting with us, yet will be ready to contribute their service in this less conspicuous line.

If attention is given to withdraw from the enemy their artificers of every denomination and provide for them in this corps, it will act in a double proportion in our favor by getting what we deprive them of.

Many good consequences may be expected from such encouragement, and by arranging them according to their abilities or zeal they will render essential service to Government on very reasonable terms. If employed when not on other duties in building boats and armed vessels for the use of the service, and manning those vessels with the dependants of the corps whose inclinations and turn lead them to

commence actively for us, we may induce many who as yet have kept back from acting for us, to begin by degrees and adopt more active sentiments, and latterly afford the fullest exertions in their power.

Such an establishment will point out a rendezvous to all unemployed adherents who do not contribute their services in the field; numbers must come to it for employment, and the produce of their labour (which will not cost Government the third of the present expence) will soon raise a powerful fleet of cruizers which will benefit those employed in them, distress our enemies, and protect our own trade.

Such 300 men to be enlisted and disciplined upon the same footing as the other part of the corps are, with this difference that when employed in working they shall receive double subsistance.

The knowledge Captain Cochrane has of the people and country, the attention he has paid to study those who compose the army and turn them to the best advantage for the service, and his own attachment for the possession induce him to hope, if intrusted with the conducting this new appointment, either according to the above idea or on any similar one which it may please Government to adopt.

That if honored with the command and rank of Lieutenant Colonel in the army he will execute it to the advantage of Government and his own credit.

THE following Proposals are made of increasing the strength of the British Legion now in America with very little expence to Government. If the corps is put on the British Establishment, and the officers in it admitted to reap the same honor and advantage from their profession as the new levies at home have.

The present establishment of the Legion is 1 Lieut Colonel and 2 Majors, with 5 Troops of Cavalry, and 6 Companys of Infantry.

It is proposed to form now 6 Troops of Cavalry, and 8 Companys of Infantry, with 1 Lieut Colonel and 1 Major to the Cavalry and 1 Lieut Colonel and 1 Major to the Infantry. — To be under the command of Lieut Colonel Tarleton or Senior Officer.

Strength of the Legion to be

| | Lieut Col. | Major | Captain | Lieutenant | Cornet or Ensign | Surgeon | Mate | Adjutant | Qr. Master | Serjeants | Corporals | Drum or Trump. | Private Rank and File |
|----------|------------|-------|---------|------------|------------------|---------|------|----------|------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Cavalry | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 18 | 12 | 438 |
| Infantry | 1 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 24 | 24 | 16 | 562 |
| | 2 | 2 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 42 | 42 | 28 | 1000 |

If Government are pleased to adopt this establishment for the Corps, The friends of Lieutenant Colonel Tarleton and Major Cochrane will immediately raise a body of men for the purpose of recruiting and strengthening the British Legion in America.

They shall be ready to join the Corps as soon as the new appointments preparing for them can be got ready to send out to America.

They [the] high estimation the services of the Legion have placed them in, with the exertions of Lieut-Colonel Tarleton's and Major Cochrane's friends within the circle of their influence, induce them to offer to raise a body of 300^d men who shall immediately join the Legion in America.

If they are permitted to get the rank of Lieut-Colonel in the Army — and to the Legion may be annexed that body of men for manning the boats, vessels, &c., as proposed by Major Cochrane, who will undertake the conduction of it.

The Memorial is without date, but must have been written later than August 16, 1780 ; but whether written in England or in America, or who his Lordship was to whom it was addressed, does not appear. Captain Cochrane had obtained leave of absence to visit England ; and it is quite probable that he did so in 1780–81, and that on his return he brought his wife with him to New York.

In October, 1781, Captain Cochrane was sent with despatches from Sir Henry Clinton, then in New York, to Lord Cornwallis, then besieged at Yorktown. He went in a vessel to the Capes, where he got into an open boat, in which he passed undiscovered through the middle of the French fleet, and arrived at Yorktown 10th October. Lord Cornwallis, in testimony of his approbation of that intrepid conduct, appointed Major Cochrane to act as one of his aides-de-camp, October 16 ; but the next day his head was taken off by a cannon-ball, the day before the surrender, Oct. 18, 1781, in the thirty-third year of his age.

A different account says : —

“ Another marked casualty of the siege was the death of Major Cochrane, who arrived at Yorktown on the 10th of October, with despatches from Clinton to Cornwallis. Two days after, in company with the British General, he went to the lines, and fired one of the guns himself ; but as he looked over the parapet to see its effect *in ricochet*, a ball from the American works carried away his head, narrowly missing Cornwallis, who was standing by his side.”¹

¹ Johnston's The Yorktown Campaign, 1781, p. 138.

An extract from a letter of Captain Mure to Andrew Stuart, dated Yorktown, Oct. 21, 1781, says:—

“I am sorry to be obliged to tell you that your nephew, Major Cochrane, suffered among those killed. He had his head carried off by a cannon-shot when standing close to my Lord Cornwallis. He came two [seven] days before, in a most spirited manner, with despatches from the Commander-in-Chief, in a small boat, and got through the French fleet; he is much lamented as a most gallant officer. I pity poor Mrs. Cochrane, who, I hear, is at New York.”¹

Major Cochrane was the only field officer of the British army who was killed at Yorktown.

Dr. WILLIAM EVERETT called attention to the debates in the House of Commons after the overthrow of the Coalition Ministry, in 1783, as showing the practice at that time with regard to the custody of public documents, about which there had been some discussion at a previous meeting of the Society, and referred particularly to the department of the Paymaster of the Forces. The accounts were considered as belonging to the officer who made them, and were retained by his executors.

Mr. WILLIAM H. WHITMORE spoke of an engraved portrait of Increase Mather by Joseph Emmes, published in 1701, which had recently come into his possession, and which shows a different state of the plate from the copy in the Prince Library. His remarks elicited brief observations by Mr. HAMILTON A. HILL and Mr. ABNER C. GOODELL, Jr.

Mr. W. S. APPLETON called attention to the sale among the Leffingwell autographs of a paper-money bill of the same issue as the bill presented by Mr. Nourse at the April meeting. So rare is this bill, and so great was the competition for it, that it is said to have brought \$136 at the auction sale.

Judge Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., was elected a Resident Member, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Judge Devens.

The Rev. OCTAVIUS B. FROTHINGHAM presented the memoir of President James Walker which he had been appointed to write for the Proceedings.

¹ Mahon's History of England, vol. vii. appendix xxxviii.

MEMOIR
OF
REV. JAMES WALKER, D.D., LL.D.

BY OCTAVIUS BROOKS FROTHINGHAM.

JAMES WALKER was born, August 16, 1794, in Burlington, Massachusetts, — a high, breezy village, with delightful surroundings. It was then a part of Woburn, which originally belonged to Charlestown.

His father was John Walker, who was commissioned as a major-general in 1798 by President John Adams, and commanded our forces at Oxford, when hostilities were apprehended from the French. The mother was Lucy Johnson, a descendant from Capt. Edward Johnson, who was a surveyor, military leader, chronicler, and poet laureate of the colony, and the author of the "Wonder-Working Providence of Zion's Saviour in New England." The family was distinguished. Judge Walker, of Ohio, and Sears Cook Walker, the mathematician and astronomer, belonged to it. An uncle, Timothy Walker, was a prominent member of the "Second Church" in Charlestown. There was another Timothy Walker, who was minister of the new settlement in the wilderness at Penacook, now Concord, New Hampshire, and whose daughter was the first wife of Count Rumford. His ancestors came early from old England, in the first company of settlers. They were of the substantial and sturdy yeoman stock. There were two sons, the only children of John Walker. One of them, an elder brother John, was unfortunate, and died leaving no mark. James was a studious boy, very fond of his books, and exceedingly reluctant to be taken from them to perform any domestic service. By great efforts on his part and on the part of his father, he was sent to Groton, a pleasant town in Middlesex

County, Massachusetts, about thirteen miles from Lowell. The academy there, afterward known as the Lawrence Academy, in commemoration of William and Amos Lawrence, its most munificent patrons, was incorporated in 1793, a year before James Walker was born. He remained there, with occasional absences, from the autumn of 1807 to that of 1810. Nothing is known of his school life; but in 1810 he entered Harvard College, from which he was graduated in 1814, along with William H. Prescott, Pliny Merrick, Elijah Paine, Alvan Lamson, Andrew Bigelow, and F. W. P. Greenwood.

He did not distinguish himself early in college, partly owing, perhaps, to a defective preparation, but more, I am inclined to think, to his scholarship and his devotion to severe studies. He never sought distinction or fame, and was never fond of display; but substantial learning was his passion. That he was a hard-working student is evident from a paper on "Occultation," which exists in manuscript in the library of Harvard College, and is dated Oct. 19, 1813, — an honor which was given to six only of the other members of his class; namely, Andrew Bigelow, Gamaliel Bradford, S. D. Bradford, B. A. Gould, Alvan Lamson, and Francis Dallas Quash. At the close of his senior year the second English oration was assigned to him. After leaving Cambridge, he spent a year as an assistant teacher at Phillips Academy in Exeter, and then returned to enter the Divinity School.

This institution was not fully organized when he was graduated in 1817; but in 1811 a beginning was made by the bequest of the Hon. Samuel Dexter, of Mendon, Massachusetts, a gentleman who had retired early from public life and devoted himself to his favorite pursuit, the study of theology; "resting," as his biographer says, "his own hope of future existence on the divine origin of the Christian religion, and believing that many of the difficulties which lead to deism and infidelity would vanish were the passages objected to critically explained, he established his lectureship for that most useful branch of learning, a critical knowledge of the Holy Scripture." Henry Ware, who had been elected to the Hollis professorship in the College in 1805, then began a course of exercises with the resident students in divinity, in which he was aided by President Kirkland, who lectured on Dogmatic Theology. Professor Willard taught Hebrew. Mr. Andrews Norton, as Dexter

Lecturer in 1813, lectured on Sacred Literature. Professor Frisbie, appointed Alford Professor of Moral Philosophy and Civil Polity in 1817, lectured on Ethics. Most of these men had duties in the College, and voluntarily undertook to direct the studies of the theological students. Between 1811 and 1818 many who were afterward distinguished in the various walks of life, like Joseph Allen, Edward Everett, Samuel A. Eliot, Samuel Gilman, Henry Ware, Jr., Alvan Lamson, James Walker, Convers Francis, Jared Sparks, John G. Palfrey, and John Pierpont, appeared. The first to lecture on this foundation was Joseph S. Buckminster, who was succeeded by William Ellery Channing in 1812. Mr. Norton came after him in 1813. When the Association of the Alumni of the Divinity School was formed, in 1839, James Walker became its first president. The organization of the Divinity School as a distinctive part of Harvard College was made in 1817, at the urgent instance of President Kirkland; and the first annual visitation at which dissertations are said to have been delivered was on December 17 of that year, and one of these dissertations is said to have been read by James Walker. At a meeting of the Boston Association held at the house of Dr. Channing, on May 5, 1817, young Walker was licensed to preach. It is a curious circumstance that Mr. Thomas Prentiss—the first minister of the Charlestown society, and the immediate predecessor of Mr. Walker—joined the association at the same time. Early in 1818 Mr. Walker, having declined a call to Lexington, received one to Charlestown. There he remained as minister nearly twenty-two years, until Feb. 18, 1839, when he resigned, being called to Cambridge, as Alford Professor of Natural Theology, Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity, in Harvard College. He entered on the duties of his professorship in the autumn of 1839, and left them in February, 1853, being made President of the College. He resigned the latter office in January, 1860, when he was sixty-six years old, in spite of the imploring appeals of the friends of the College, who offered to help him with the harder duties if he would stay. After that he devoted his time to philosophy and literature, writing and lecturing and preaching. His eightieth birthday was celebrated by such of his old parishioners as were living, and by many friends. There were speeches, poems, and a handsome gift of silver. The proceedings were commemorated

in a pamphlet, privately printed and distributed among those who took part in the gift.

We must consider Dr. Walker, therefore, under three aspects, — as Minister, as Professor, and as President. Previous to 1815 there had been amity among the Congregational churches of New England. There was earnest investigation, great difference of opinion, rather vehement debate; but ministers who were directly opposed to one another in theology were good friends, and lived together as brethren. Their discussions usually closed with prayer, and often an exchange of pulpits for the following Sunday was agreed upon without any regard to divergence in speculative views. But about 1815 a departure from the old rule began. The discussion grew into dispute, and the debate ripened into controversy.

The "friends of religion" were publicly called upon to "come out," and refuse ecclesiastical intercourse with professors of the liberal faith. Thus there was opened a wide breach between the Trinitarians and the Unitarians, which was deepened and widened by words on both sides. The First Church in Charlestown was then under the charge of the Rev. Dr. Morse, one of the foremost leaders and most aggressive disputants in the Orthodox ranks. Dr. Morse did all he could, by writing and speaking, to cast discredit on the leaders of the liberal movement, and threw out abusive words against men perfectly honest in their methods and irreproachable in their lives. In his own parish the Unitarians were, of course, in number the smaller party; but in weight of character they were the larger, for the best elements of respectability, culture, and moral influence were with them. The Second Church grew out of this dispute, and was a secession from the First Church. The separation, however, was peaceful. Not a step was taken by the dissentients which was not in entire consistency with respect and friendship toward the First Church. The good temper on the part of those who withdrew was in a large measure the cause of this; but another reason may have been powerful, as James Walker said in his parting sermon: —

"The peace with England, which took place about the same time (1815), had something to do with the gathering of this church. That event, it will be recollected, had the effect of producing a general amnesty in regard to political differences; so that nothing was left of the

estrangement, which originated in political causes, to hinder those who thought and felt alike on the subject of religion from coming together and acting in concert."

Fortunately at this juncture a church edifice, then belonging to the Baptists, afterward occupied by the Methodists, was offered for sale by the administrator of the estate of the late Mr. Harrison, into whose hands it had fallen. The liberal Congregationalists took advantage of this condition, bought the church, repaired it, and opened it for worship on the 9th of May, 1816. In this church Dr. Walker was ordained, as also his predecessor, who lay here in his coffin. These were the days of Ecclesiastical Councils. Dr. (then Mr.) Channing moved that the candidate be desired to give some account of his faith; whereupon Mr. Walker presented the following creed:—

"I believe in God, the Creator and Preserver of all things, visible and invisible. I believe in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Messiah of the Hebrew prophets, and the only appointed Saviour of mankind. I believe in the Sacred Scriptures, that they were dictated by inspiration, and form the only standard of faith and practice. I believe in the divine institution of the visible Church, in the resurrection of the dead, man's future accountability, and life everlasting."

Then the council declared itself satisfied, and the procession moved toward the church. After the exercises there was a dinner at which eighty-four people drank nine decanters of brandy, nineteen bottles of costly Madeira wine, twenty-one bottles of common Madeira wine, and smoked twelve dozen cigars.

In less than a year after his settlement, Mr. Walker dedicated the present meeting-house of the society. At this dedication was Dr. John Pierce, who recalls his impressions in the following language:—

"Mr. Walker preached fifty-two minutes, from 2 Corinthians x. 7, in defense of himself and liberal Christians in general against the aspersions cast on them by their opponents. It was written and delivered in a very energetick manner. The temper and spirit of the discourse appeared somewhat similar to the late Dr. Mayhew's. I should judge that the sermon was adapted rather to enrage than to conciliate opponents."

That this consequence happened appears from the fact that some who were present declared that they would never enter

again the walls of the meeting-house, because of the character of the pastor's sermon on that day. Later, Dr. Walker himself acknowledged the justice of this description. Thomas Prentiss, whom he succeeded, was born Jan. 11, 1793; and died on Oct. 5, 1817, of fever, after a short illness. It is interesting to read that he had a "sound mind and careful judgement, and an entire freedom from that precipitancy, either in judging or acting, which is sometimes ruinous to the best intentions. Perhaps the quality of Christian prudence was his one particular perfection, which made him to be one in whom you could altogether confide, and who would never disappoint you by doing anything wrong or ill-judged." He is said to have been "studious of avoiding offence as to his subjects and manner of treating them." He is said, again, to have been "remarkably cool and deliberate in forming his opinions, and never was suspected of taking them upon trust. Sometimes, indeed, he has been thought to carry his caution to excess." Rev. Joseph Allen, D.D., speaks of his "practical good sense, which is so important to the success of the Christian minister, and of which he possessed a more than common share." If this had been a description of Mr. Walker, it could not have been better, for that was his chief characteristic. As a preacher Mr. Walker was unique. Channing was more ethereal, Gilman was more sentimental, Greenwood was more poetical; but for massive power of ethical statement Walker was superior to Sparks or Burnap or Palfrey. He was settled at a time of violent controversy, — a period which was short but severe, — and in his early ministry he was a vehement polemic and champion of the liberal faith, called, by some who admired him most, "The Warrior," though he was never vituperative or unfair. But all this wore away. In his later preaching the controversialist did not in the least appear; it was merely grave and serious, the impetuosity having given way to a deep-seated earnestness. In fact, two things have surprised me as I reviewed his life: one was that he ever was a young man, — for as I knew him he was old, sober, ponderous, shuffling in gait, with shaggy eyebrows and rather a stern expression; the other, that he ever was impulsive, — for as I knew and heard him, the fire was so latent in him that it seldom or never came to the surface.

His fame as a "vigorous, eloquent, and convincing preacher "

spread abroad so that he was invited to settle in Washington and in Baltimore, — posts which after mature consideration he declined, feeling that his influence was as great and less uncertain in Charlestown. In 1825 he helped to organize the American Unitarian Association, and was on the first Board of Directors and also on its Executive Committee. That same year he was chosen an Overseer of Harvard College, and in 1834 was made a Fellow of the Corporation, — an office he held until he became President of the University in 1853. In 1837 his church was called the Harvard Church, in memory of John Harvard, who left to the College not only his books and half of his fortune, but his name and fame. His style of preaching was clear, simple, concise, logical, and exceedingly impressive. An air of supreme conviction animated his whole person. His gestures were few, but they were emphatic, and in his early days the pulpit cushion showed the effects of his demonstration. Some of his sermons remain to this day in the memory of those who heard them forty years ago. As a pastor he was most devoted and laborious. His interest as a citizen was broad and influential. He had a great concern for public schools. He edited the "Christian Examiner" from 1835 to 1839, partly with Mr. Greenwood and partly alone. The "Christian Examiner" Society was organized Jan. 27, 1829; and the first publishing committee consisted of Mr. Walker, Mr. Greenwood, and Dr. Ware. Mr. Walker was one of the original members of the society who conducted the first series.

While in Charlestown, in 1829, he was married to Miss Catherine Bartlett, the daughter of Mr. George Bartlett, then chairman of the Parish Committee; but he was childless, and lived entirely in his work. Under his ministry the parish in Charlestown rose from ninety-five families to about two hundred and twenty-five; and this in spite of the fact that many had left the place, though the town itself had gradually grown. His consecration to the Christian ministry was entire, as he says himself in his parting sermon, preached July 14, 1839:

"I have been content to labor in my proper sphere, as a Christian minister, making it a paramount object not to jeopardize my influence in that capacity by officiousness in other matters. I am not one of those who cannot bear to be told that they have an 'appropriate sphere.' I have not supposed myself to be placed here to do all sorts of good to all sorts of persons in all sorts of ways, as it might happen; but to ful-

fil a particular vocation. This vocation was, as I conceived, to do all the good I could in my capacity as a Christian minister, first to my own people, and then to the community at large, and whatever other good was not inconsistent with this, or did not interfere with it. Accordingly I have wholly forborne to mingle in politics, even to the extent of waiving my right of suffrage. I have seldom taken any part in local and exciting questions of a secular nature; neither have I been anxious to put myself forward among the leaders in all contested cases of reform. To this, I own, some will object that a person does not cease to be a man and citizen simply because he is a minister. True; but then I suppose a person does not cease to be a man and citizen merely because for good reasons he waives assertion, or at least the exercise, of certain of his rights. 'Aye; he may waive his rights, but not his duties, and it is the duty of every citizen to vote.' And this, also, is true; provided only that it does not come into collision with a still higher duty, in which event the former ceases to be a duty. Now, it seems to me that the duty which a minister owes to his influence as a minister is a higher one than that which he owes to his influence as a common man in society. Will it be said, as it sometimes has been, as if to show the untenableness of this position, that a minister is more of a citizen than he is of a minister, and more of a man than he is of a citizen? True, again; but what follows? A man, to carry out the same sort of reasoning, is more of a thing than he is of a man; but does it follow that he ought to set a higher value on his relations as a thing than on his relations as a man? The argument, if it proves anything, proves too much. Add to this that a minister who has a mind for such things, if personally he keeps aloof from the party movements of the day, will find himself in a condition on that very account to act with more power on the prevailing ideas by which those movements are ultimately swayed and determined. But will this reasoning apply to contested cases of social and moral reform? Here many will say it is a minister's place to take the lead on one side or the other. And they are right as regards questions which fall naturally within his province; but not so when the main question or the involved question is one which his habits of life or condition in society are not such as to qualify him to decide. . . . As a general rule I have forborne to bring into the pulpit topics on which I was not pretty sure of being able to make myself understood. It is a common remark among those who love to use strong and unqualified expressions, that the truth never does any harm; and in this I am disposed to concur generally, if by truth is meant truth *well understood*. But truth may be misunderstood, and truth misunderstood is error, which certainly may do harm, and this form of error more perhaps than any other. At the same time I do not belong to the number of those who think that the topics of preaching must be

taken from the surface of things. I do not believe in superficial preaching. I do not believe that there are any truths deeply interesting to humanity, which are so profound that they cannot, if treated in an earnest and plain manner, be made sufficiently intelligible to common minds, provided only that those minds are not in a morbid state of excitement in regard to the question under discussion."

His duties as a preacher were arduous as his fame as a preacher extended. He told me once, that he made a point of writing twenty-five sermons a year. He thought that that was as much as anybody ought to write. The only wonder was, to me, that he could write so many, demanding as much thought as they must have done. After his death a mural tablet was placed in the church; and when he left the society there was great lamentation, both among young and old, — to the former of whom he had endeared himself, while to the latter he always remained the most convincing preacher they ever listened to. His old people in Charlestown wanted him to come to them again, after leaving the presidency of Harvard College, and offered him a colleague if he wanted one; but he conscientiously declined.

James Walker received his full share of literary and academic honors. Harvard College conferred upon him the degree of D.D. in 1835; that of LL.D. in 1860; and Yale College made him LL.D. in 1853.

Though conservative in method, he was progressive in spirit. He declared: —

"The glory of Unitarianism will have departed if the time should ever come when its advocates and friends are unfaithful to the noble maxim laid down at the revival of the doctrine by the Polish reformers: *We are not ashamed to improve.* Let us forever cherish it as an honorable distinction that there is nothing in our principles which makes improvement an inconsistency; that we do not take the ground of those sects which assume that they have attained to all truth already, or to infallible truth, so that any defection from the existing faith or worship, even by themselves, must be mortal sin. It is the first boast of liberal Christianity, which is doing more and more to recommend it in a critical age like the present, that it does not make safety to depend on having found out all truth, but on being guided by 'the spirit of truth.' Hence it is to be regarded rather as a living and gradual development of Christianity, than as a petrification of one of its existing forms."

Again : —

“ Every sect, I suppose, may be said to represent some one of the leading ideas of Christianity, inasmuch as it does more than others to bring out the idea, and give it currency and effect in the world. Thus, the Catholic Church may be said to represent the idea of reverence ; Calvinism, the idea of self-abasement ; Methodism the idea of divine love ; Quakerism, the idea of inward light ; and in the same way Unitarianism, or Liberal Christianity, may be said to represent the idea of harmony and peace. Its doctrine is : ‘ And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three ; but the greatest of these is charity.’ . . . We also bear in mind that other people have consciences as well as we.”

The man who could say this more than fifty years ago, certainly deserves to be ranked with advanced minds.

James Walker was always an ardent student of philosophy, but his mind was rather English than German or French. “ Good sense,” he said, “ *must* be ; other things *may* be, but good sense *must* be.” Though he was well acquainted, of course, with Spinoza, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, he did not thoroughly enter into their spirit. His genius was of another order ; as is evident from his edition of Dugald Stewart’s “ Philosophy of the Active and Moral Powers ” (1849), and Dr. Thomas Reid’s “ Essays on the Intellectual Powers, with Notes and Illustrations from Sir William Hamilton and Others,” published in 1850, as an abridgment for the college boys ; also from his lectures before the Lowell Institute on “ Natural Religion ” and “ The Philosophy of Religion,” — four courses of lectures in Boston which were never published, but a selection from which may be issued by Professor Lovering, his literary executor. He was well acquainted with the reasonings of the Transcendentalists, whose books he was fond of reading, though he smiled at some of their expressions.

George Ripley names him as among the earliest Transcendentalists, and there are expressions of his that serve to justify this judgment ; for example, the following words from “ The Philosophy of Man’s Spiritual Nature in regard to the Foundations of Faith,” wherein he seemed to take the Transcendentalist ground : —

“ That the existence of those spiritual faculties and capacities which are assumed as the foundation of religion in the soul of man is attested beyond controversy by the revelations of conscience ; that religion in

the soul, consisting as it does of a manifestation and development of these spiritual faculties and capacities, is as much a reality in itself, and enters as essentially into our idea of a perfect man, as the corresponding manifestation and development of the reasoning faculties, a sense of justice, or the affections of sympathy and benevolence; and that from the acknowledged existence and reality of spiritual impressions or perceptions we may and do assume the existence and reality of the spiritual world, just as from the acknowledged existence and reality of sensible impressions or perceptions we may and do assume the existence and reality of the sensible world. . . . Let us hope that a better philosophy than the degrading sensualism out of which most forms of infidelity have grown will prevail, and that the minds of the rising generation will be thoroughly imbued with it. Let it be a philosophy which recognizes the higher nature of man, and aims, in a chastened and reverential spirit, to unveil the mysteries of his higher life. Let it be a philosophy which comprehends the soul,—a soul susceptible of religion, of the sublime principles of faith, and the faith which ‘entereth into that within the veil.’ Let it be a philosophy which continually reminds us of our intimate relations to the spiritual world; which opens to us new sources of consolation in trouble, and new sources of life in death,—nay, which teaches us that what we call death is but the dying of all that is mortal, that nothing but life may remain.”

But on close scrutiny of these passages I am persuaded that they are simply used to legitimate the religious affections.

In a discourse before the Alumni of the Cambridge Divinity School, he praised such men as Schleiermacher and De Wette; welcomed Jacobi, Cousin, Jouffroy, and Degerando, and then said: “Men may put down Transcendentalism if they can, but they must first deign to comprehend its principles.”

But, after all, James Walker was only a moderate Transcendentalist. In the *Journal of Theodore Parker* (Feb. 8, 1838) there is mentioned a discussion touching Dr. Walker’s lectures on Philosophy, in the course of which Dr. Channing expressed the idea that the lecturer approached very near materialism himself, and objected that he spoke of thought as putting the brain in action, as the digestive force moves the stomach, and the hepatic the liver. Dr. Hedge told me, in a letter, that Dr. Walker was once present at a meeting in Cambridge of the Transcendentalists, but ever after held his peace.

The truth seems to be that his genius was rather practical than speculative. He liked a philosophy of common-sense,

plain, homely, intelligible to the common mind ; a philosophy that one can build upon in every-day life.

Every great thinker must believe in universals, as he did ; but *his* universal was not an intellectual doctrine so much as a moral principle. Conscience, in his estimation, needed educating, but it was essentially an authority in all men.

One of his friends said that his great strength lay in making statements ; and another said that he never made a statement in his life. Both are probably correct ; for in formal logic he was very strong, leaving out all considerations that might be considered incidental, and confining himself to the most simple elements of his subject.

As a professor, his work was particularly interesting to young men, for he led their minds upward, and gave them views of intellectual truth that were at the same time instructive and inspiring. He was a professor while I was in college, and showed the utmost graciousness in answering all the questions of his pupils. He was anything but a materialist, and though avoiding extreme conclusions in every direction, he never wavered in his extreme protest against every form of philosophy that seemed to endanger the moral sentiments. He was a great believer in the Supreme Law of Duty.

When James Walker was nominated as President of Harvard College, in 1853, by the Board of Overseers, he was unanimously confirmed in spite of his supposed doctrinal position, although there were gentlemen on the board who were not of his own opinions ; and this is probably the only case of the kind on record. He brought to the office a thorough acquaintance with all the affairs of the College, both as regards its history in the past and its position in the present ; an intense interest in the cause of education, both in its lowest and its highest forms ; a singular attraction toward young men, and a strong personal concern for their moral advance. He was no *doctrinaire*, but took things as they were, — as far removed from the disposition that was prone to quarrel because the University was not equal to English universities, as from the inclination to find fault because the young men were not quite perfect in all the virtues. He was the nineteenth president, and the immediate successor of Jared Sparks, who in turn succeeded Edward Everett. No great reforms in administration were instituted by him, but his reports on the

condition of the College were full of suggestions. One of them, made in 1869, and signed by James Freeman Clarke and James Walker, with five others, was especially remarkable for its recommendations. Thus, though his administration was not distinguished by any specific results, he accomplished a great deal in the way of elevating the tone of the University. His predecessors, Mr. Everett and Mr. Sparks, frequently availed themselves of his practical sagacity, and there was no branch of his own administration that did not show the fruits of his wisdom. He resigned the post in 1860, not because he was tired of the duties, which he performed conscientiously, laboriously, and with the utmost regard to detail, but principally on account of physical infirmity. His later years were spent in industry of a rather exacting nature, in philosophical and literary employments, reading and writing; and though on account of his lameness he led a secluded life, his days were spent in a manner that never reminded one of any loss of mental power.

Time would fail me to speak of his humility and unfeigned modesty, which forbade him to make any display of himself. His distinguishing trait was prudence, the careful avoidance of any public expression of strong personal opinion, the moral aspect of wise foresight. As has been well said: —

“No one was more curious or keen than he in watching the tentative stages of the development of the Rationalistic school. He read and tried to digest all its contributions to the press. He was interested in the position and attitude of all our professional men — scholars, thinkers, and writers — in this ferment of opinions and notions; with the spirit of progress, in all truth and wisdom, he was in perfect sympathy. With some of the methods pursued, and some of the anticipatory boastings, claimed as reached, he did not accord. Two very significant movements having special import to one of his profession and position, went forward in the circle of which he was at the centre at the period of his most vigorous life,— the transcendental movement in the field of speculation, and the antislavery and related reforms on the political field. . . . He was cautious and reticent about them. Publicly he did not betray himself or set himself on either side; and many on either side would have been glad to have claimed and followed him as leader and champion. Wagers were often proposed as to how his vote or ballot would be cast; but no money was lost in the hazard, as in such critical cases as prompted it he did not vote at all.”

But this excessive caution could not be ascribed to cowardice, for he never was a coward; nor to cunning, for he was not wary in the sense of wishing to avoid disagreeable consequences; but rather to a wish to be perfectly just to all sides, and to a desire not to commit himself to premature conclusions. He may have been a sceptic; but if he was, he was a sceptic in the best sense of the word, — not a disbeliever so much as one who wished to consider, to ponder, to look at a subject on all sides. Perhaps he saw quicksands where others thought it was all solid ground: and he was unwilling to break the bruised reed or to quench the smoking flax, or to depress the smallest hope of a better life which might possibly spring up in the human breast. Of one thing he never doubted, — the absolute importance of goodness, the absolute authority of reason. In a sermon preached at King's Chapel in 1861, at the outbreak of the war, on "The Spirit Proper to the Times," the theme of discourse is the sacrifice of property, labor, and life. In this sermon I find the following language, — he is denouncing the Southern confederacy: —

"By striking at the principles of all constitutional and free government, and this, too, avowedly for the purpose of founding society on the servitude of an inferior race, on whose toil the more favored races are to live, they put themselves in opposition to the settled convictions and moral sentiments of good men all over the world."

He speaks of them as "made to believe a lie"; he imputes to them "efforts to sophisticate conscience," to make "wrong come out right," to "alter the nature of things," and to overturn the "laws of Nature." He called them a "doomed people," and predicted their discomfiture, on the ground of his faith in the moral sentiments of mankind and the justice of Heaven. In the address delivered before the Legislature of Massachusetts, at the annual election, in 1863, the most depressing period of the war, he says: —

"I believe the community has been slowly improving; growing more moral, more religious, more humane. . . . I am filled with mingled sorrow, disgust, and dismay when I see the false views and intense hate entertained there [at the South] against the Free States. . . . I believe in human progress, otherwise I should not believe in anything. . . . Not a tear, not a drop of blood, is shed in vain."

He recommends "a true, hearty, and unconditional loyalty to the government." He discerns but two demoralizing ten-

dencies, — one speculative, and of intellectual men, in regard to the principles of good government; the other practical, the substituting of loyalty to party for loyalty to the State. There is not a word of discouragement in the whole discourse. True, he complained of lack in civic virtue, but in this alone. His confidence in the *democratic* principle is absolute; and the only thing he finds fault with is the abstinence of good men from their duty as citizens. He is not complimentary to the advocates of the Higher Law, but simply because he objects to any identification of the private conscience with the supreme equity. He calls conscience a *sensibility*, not a *judgment*. True, at critical times he did not vote himself; but this was because he did not choose to take sides with any party, or commit himself to any form of policy; but he never failed, either in public or in private, to throw his whole personal influence in favor of law, order, and peace.

He was an exceedingly modest man, always listening for others' opinions, and never failing to give reasons for his own. Herein he was a rationalist, pure and simple; not a believer in despotism of any kind, but putting his own mind on a level with that of others, and rendering the contest one of argument, not of personality.

His wisdom was celebrated; his knowledge of human nature, his appreciation of human motives. An able and brilliant lawyer used to say that there was no day of his life when he did not recall some saying of Dr. Walker; and another lawyer, now living, assured me that some years ago when he was intimate with Walker, he could have said the same thing.

His influence on the character of young men was something extraordinary. He formed their lives, and in many instances rescued them from moral dangers, to which they were liable. He had the "loving spirit of wisdom," which always cultivated the seeds of good, in full faith that they would overcome the growth of evil.

He had, too, a very pleasant and incisive wit, of which I will give but one example. An eminent vegetarian was expatiating with him on his own theory of food, and in praise of his system was celebrating its influence in making men innocent and gentle. "To eat flesh," he said, "is to make yourself carnal. They who eat beasts become beastly." "On the same principle," said Walker, "I suppose that one who

lives on vegetables becomes a vegetable, and one who eats nothing but potatoes becomes a potato ; but how if the potatoes are *small* ?” His cheerfulness was invariable ; his hopefulness of events. He always took a happy view of every accident or incident. His companionship was delightful. The variety of his expression was very great. He was never subject to moods of depression. He had no sad recollections, except such as are inseparable from private loss.

His personal piety was beyond question, and deepened with years. “With all his thinkings and reasonings,” says a good judge, “he had studied himself into, and not out of, that strong and cheerful religious faith which is the best blessing of life as it passes, and the only welcome and sufficient solace at its close.” Another friend bears witness to Dr. Walker’s “deep sense of nearness and love of the Father, his confidence in His wisdom, trust in His mercy, fidelity to duty, patience under trial, steadfast adherence to the cause of truth, kindness of thought and speech, and his unflinching fortitude and faith.” His virtue was not that which comes of subduing passion, for he seemed to have no violent passions to subdue ; his cleanness was apparently native and original.

The incidents of his life were few. He never travelled abroad, for the reason that he had no passion for romance ; and his journeyings here were neither long nor frequent. Of æsthetic tastes he had absolutely none, — no love for music, or painting, or sculpture, or art of any kind. He was a good deal like the man who knew two tunes : one was Old Hundred, and *the other was n’t*. But he was fond of flowers, was moved by all the aspects of Nature, and especially impressed by the magnificence and apparent infinity of the sea. His acquaintance with general literature was limited. He knew important works, — Shakespeare, Milton, Bacon, Butler, and the like, — but in lighter literature he did not pretend to be at home.

His published writings were numerous. Besides the edition of Thomas Reid and Dugald Stewart, which we have already mentioned, there were a good many printed sermons (some of which in the early Unitarian controversy were printed as tracts) ; many contributions to the “Christian Examiner” ; four or five articles in the “Liberal Preacher,” a periodical from 1828 to 1837 ; three publications in the “Monthly Religious Magazine,” a periodical published in Boston from 1844

to 1874, when its title was changed to "The Unitarian Review"; and several contributions to the Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, including a memoir of Daniel Appleton White, in September, 1862; a memoir of Josiah Quincy, in March, 1866; and remarks in memory of William H. Prescott, February, 1859; D. A. White, April, 1861; Cornelius Conway Felton, March, 1862; Alvan Lamson, August, 1864; Edward Everett, January, 1865; N. L. Frothingham, April, 1870. Papers in the "Christian Disciple," which began in 1813 and lived until 1824, and then changed its title and became the "Christian Examiner," were from his pen. Besides this there was a "Service Book for Sunday Schools," with a collection of hymns, compiled for the use of the Boylston Chapel in Charlestown in 1839.

A volume of Dr. Walker's sermons, preached chiefly in the Chapel of Harvard College, was published in Boston in 1861. His address at his inauguration as President was also published; and another which he gave, in 1856, before the American Institute of Instruction. A posthumous volume of sermons, entitled "Reason, Faith, and Duty," was issued in 1877. A "Memorial" of Dr. Walker was published in Cambridge in 1875, and also the services that were held at the dedication of the mural monument in 1884. His library he left to Harvard College, to which also he bequeathed the fifteen thousand dollars that were raised for him by friends when he left the presidency.

At the dedication of a mural monument to James Walker, in the Harvard Church, on Jan. 14, 1883, besides the discourse by William O. White, and the addresses of Charles W. Eliot, Joseph Lovering, Pitt Dillingham, and letters from George E. Ellis, Thomas Hill, William H. Furness, Alexander McKenzie, Robert C. Winthrop, Charles Devens, Frederic A. Farley, Amos A. Lawrence, and Abbott Lawrence, there were letters of regret from Oliver Wendell Holmes, Andrew P. Peabody, Theodore Lyman, John D. Long, Samuel A. Green, Marshall P. Wilder, Samuel K. Lothrop, Robert C. Waterston, John C. Ropes, Henry Cabot Lodge, Charles E. Grinnell, Francis G. Peabody, and others. The monument was the gift of Miss Hunt, the daughter of Reuben Hunt, one of the founders of the society.

Dr. Walker was chosen a member of the Massachusetts

Historical Society, May 14, 1859, and, though never a prominent or eminent member, was an exceedingly useful one. His memoir of Daniel Appleton White, in 1862, and of Josiah Quincy, in 1866, involved a great deal of labor. They were most carefully and discerningly done. They were unusually long; Mr. White's being sixty-eight pages, and that of Josiah Quincy seventy-three pages. His remarks on the death of W. H. Prescott, C. C. Felton, Alvan Lamson, Edward Everett, N. L. Frothingham, and others, were concise, correct, and altogether to the point. As Mr. Winthrop said, "he certainly had the faculty of saying as much in a few sentences as any one I ever listened to."

But it was as a preacher that James Walker was distinguished. He was always a preacher, not only in Charlestown, but as a Professor at Cambridge, as President of the College, and later, as long as his strength permitted. It was understood that while professor he was to preach in the College Chapel one quarter of the time. His two volumes of sermons — the first selected by himself, in 1861; the second a volume the contents of which were with difficulty snatched from the flames by a friend, and issued after his death in 1877 — contained all his important thoughts on religion. There was no preacher at all like him. He had what is called a *presence*. His voice was not musical or melodious, but firm and impressive. His manner was solemn; his prayer tender and touching; his reading of the Scripture most effective and telling. As President Eliot remarked: —

"When he said 'There is no hiding-place,' all sinners believed him. When he said 'Thou shalt say no,' young men turned their backs on the tempter, who otherwise might have dabbled with sin. When he prayed, the least devout lifted up their hearts. When he preached salvation by hope, all people saw that the Gospel was indeed good tidings."

To quote the words of Professor Lovering: —

"The pulpit was his throne, and from it he held sovereign sway over the minds and hearts of his hearers. He had always something to preach, and he knew how to preach it. He was simple without being common-place; he was profound without being obscure. He presented the most difficult propositions with a lucidity of thought and a felicity of expression which could easily persuade his hearers that they had always known it. He might begin his sermon by address-

ing the intellect, but he never ended it until he had reached the heart."

In dedicating the church building at Charlestown, in 1819, Dr. Walker began the service by uttering in a most solemn manner, "This is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of Heaven." Addressing the young, on one occasion, Dr. Walker said: "Even the youths shall faint and be weary, and the young men shall utterly fall." Then it seemed as if the trump of the archangel had sounded; but he continued: "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint;" and then it seemed as if a clarion of triumph were sounding. He seemed to load the words with meaning. In his sermon on the Mediator, he said:—

"Through his sole mediation, that is to say, by his teaching and sufferings, by his life and death, he has broken down forever the legal and ritual impediments which were thought to separate man from his Maker, and thus opened a way of access to the Father, once for all. By a new and far more sublime revelation of grace and truth and spiritual freedom, he has opened to the whole world a door of access to the Mercy Seat, and *left it open*; and blessed be God, it is a door which no man nor body of men can shut."

The words seem easy, almost common-place; and yet as he spoke them, the effect was like that of thunder, and no thoughtful mind could doubt that perfect spiritual liberty was gained.

The causes of his popularity with young men should be specified. They were: (1) Honesty and fairness. Dr. Walker was always perfectly frank with his hearers. There is an impression that the clergy withhold from the congregation their secret thoughts. No such charge could ever be brought against James Walker. As far as he saw he made his vision apparent to all. There was no disguise and no misrepresentation. Even his opponents could not complain that he did them any intentional injustice; and his friends were often amazed at his candor. Now, if there is one thing that charms a young man, it is this absolute freedom from pretence. (2) His doctrine seemed perfectly reasonable. There was no assumed opinion, no attempt to dictate or browbeat, no

extreme conclusion; and every position taken was fortified by argument, not by assertion. (3) The moderation of his statement always commended it to young minds. He was never the champion of any particular theory, never the advocate of a special cause. (4) His sympathy with young men's trials could be counted on with entire confidence. He loved young men, took them to his heart, tried earnestly to understand their thoughts and ways and feelings, and won them, not by setting himself above them, but by putting himself on their level and claiming nothing on the ground of personal authority. Thus he drew them to him, and made them feel at home in his presence. (5) Then we must ascribe a great deal to the logical method, which he always used, and which was particularly gratifying to young minds that wanted to see the process by which results were reached. (6) His hopefulness must not be forgotten. Here is an instance of it. In a sermon on "The Dangers of College Life," he says:—

"I am unwilling to conclude the subject without repeating what I have said before: it is a pleasure and satisfaction to know that to many these dangers and difficulties exist only to be overcome, and so to be turned into occasions of triumph. To persons of good and strong purposes the promise of the Gospel is fulfilled: 'Behold I give unto you power to tread on scorpions and serpents, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing shall by any means hurt you.'"

Undoubtedly his personal character had a great deal to do with his power. There was a man always behind his word. Character is something more than mere excellence; that may be assumed, in a man like James Walker, who led a perfectly irreproachable life, and upon whose virtue there never was a stain; but more than this, he possessed an immense power of conviction, and threw the weight of a great personality into everything that he spoke, whether in public or in private.

His religious beliefs were, in a great measure, those of his age. These were the palmy days of Unitarianism, in which it expected, apparently, immediate triumph. It seemed so simple and reasonable that its swift progress was anticipated by all its adherents. When it was once shown that neither Scripture nor reason countenanced the Calvinistic faith, there was to all appearances no ground for supposing that all men

would not welcome the new doctrine. There was implicit faith in the virtue of education in its highest forms to develop the reason and conscience of men. Dr. Walker says:—

“I would not give much for a young man’s chance of eminence whose pillow is never wet with tears at the thought of difficulties to be overcome.”

And this to college students! Dr. Walker again says:—

“The moment we are in serious doubt as to what ought to be done, the conviction is forced upon us that no decree of mere consciousness will supply the place of study and experience, to a sound mind. Hence it often happens that we entertain a sincere respect for a man’s *sense* of right, but no sort of respect for his *opinion* of right.”

All the evangelical feeling was preserved. In several sermons, such as those on Prayer, Character, Spiritual Discernment, Spiritual Death, Dr. Walker expressed a deep religious experience. He says in one place:—

“Our accountability as thinking beings, our interests as moral beings, our destiny as immortal beings,—mere talking about it, mere thinking about it, mere dreaming about it *will not do*.”

Again:—

“I cannot help thinking that many a solemn-sounding Litany has been chanted by priestly lips in consecrated places to waste itself on the air, while the whole ear of Heaven was intent on some poor sailor’s ‘God help me!’ as it went up amidst the howling of the tempest from the parting wreck.”

Again:—

“If at any time your way is dark or hedged up, and you are ready to say, ‘Who is sufficient for these things?’ lean not, I beseech you, on an arm of flesh: trust me, my brother, it will prove but a broken reed.”

Once more:—

“I might go further still; I might say that it is only in so far as, in the language of the Scriptures, we become *partakers* of the Divine nature that we can enter into or even approximate the full significance of the divinity of God. . . . Prayer is addressed to an invisible being. It takes for granted two facts: first, that of a being, or perhaps many beings, of a higher order than ourselves; and, secondly, that he or they can be moved by our supplications. . . . We must not expect from God many things that we might expect from the *folly* and *weak-*

ness of a friend and father; but certainly we may expect from God what we should expect from the *wisdom* and *goodness* of a friend and father. . . . The ground and life of prayer depend on our believing not merely that there *was* a God once, the Creator of the world; but that there is one *now* and *here*, a living and personal God, witnessing everything which we do, and hearing everything which we say. . . . We should not only look upon our Heavenly Father as always near, but accustom ourselves to make known our requests to Him, asking that we may receive, and thus cultivating habitual intercourse with Him. . . . To ask whether a man can be religious without prayer is like asking whether a man can be sociable without the use of speech. . . . Whatever power or dignity the pulpit has, is owing mainly, not to its learning or eloquence, but to a generally acknowledged fact that it does not speak in its own name, but in the name which is above every name, and before which every knee should bow. . . . God is everywhere present, and everywhere active in nature. We cannot help being surrounded at all times by the universally diffused light and energy. Man can open his soul by holy exercises, by humility, by prayer, and by love, or he can keep it shut. . . . Providence opens the way by which every individual soul can be brought into instant and immediate communion with the living God. We no longer feel ourselves to be standing amidst the play of a vast and complicated machinery which is doing it knows not what. Every motion, every breath around us proclaims the instant presence and instant action of the Divinity. . . . Now, in the case of the mechanism of the universe, where is the moving force to be found, but in the universally diffused, all-directing, ever-acting energy of God? . . . Accordingly I hold that in the natural world the nature of God is everywhere, in everything; holding the sun in its place and also the mote in the sun's beam. The volcano and the bursting flower equally announce His presence. . . . What need is there of an elaborate argument to prove an immediate and universal providence, without which not a sparrow falls to the ground? Nature itself is Providence, and nothing but Providence. . . . If what I have now said is true, God is really present and active throughout nature and in all good men, in a sense and to a degree much beyond what the common opinion or the common speech seems to recognize. . . . One of the principal reasons which make the idea of a Mediator so grateful to the human heart is that, with our frail and imperfect natures, we can feel no proper sympathy with the mysterious and awful Power or Infinite One we wish to propitiate. Hence the deep and inextinguishable longing of humble and devoted minds for some one of a like nature between whom and us there can be something like a fellow-feeling; on whom to place our religious affections, and who will intercede for us before the throne of that incomprehen-

ble Being, to us unapproachable even in thought. . . . Even if it were possible to resolve every phenomenon of Nature into what are called the laws of Nature, it would not be to take a single step toward dispensing with the necessity of an all-sustaining Energy and an all-controlling Mind."

It is not necessary to say anything about his sense of the importance of a revelation, about the character and office of Jesus, the significance of the Scriptures, and the reality of miracles; but a word must be said in regard to the view of human nature which he entertained:—

"Man—the soul—is free; free to do or not to do, to obey or disobey, to yield to or resist even divine influences and suggestions. . . . What we call death takes place, and 'mortality is swallowed up in life.' The dead, then, are *not* dead. Our friends who are absent from the body are present with the Lord. They are not *here*, but they are *there*; they *live*,—fully to carry out, under more favorable circumstances, every purpose for which they were created. . . . No limit is fixed or can be fixed to any man's progress, so long as his faculties retain their natural vigor, except by his own consent. . . . While, therefore, we give up human perfection, we stand fast for *human perfectibility*. There are no arbitrary or determined bounds set to any man's progress in this life, whatever may be his condition and circumstances. . . . The way is open to every one; or if not entirely open, there is nothing in the nature of the obstructions which makes them absolutely insuperable. . . . On the contrary, every new acquisition of truth only serves to enlarge the mind for the comprehension of more truths, so that the more a man knows, the more he is in a condition to learn; and the same is likewise true of his progress in virtue. . . . However unlikely and impossible it is that we shall ever meet with a perfect man on this earth, still if we were to meet with one, we should see that instead of being a monster, he would be of all men the most entirely natural, the most truly human. . . . If human nature were developed naturally, that is to say, according to its just and intended order and proportion, there would be no misers or voluptuaries. The misers and the voluptuaries,—they are the monsters. . . . A man's moral nature is his innate capacity of moral discrimination; is part and parcel of our common human nature, and for anything known to the contrary is the same in all men. But this moral nature, this innate capacity of moral discrimination, may be wholly *latent*; as in the case of infants, who cannot be said to have any conscience, though they have a moral nature, and it is more or less so in adults. . . . Our moral nature is what God has made it to be; so that when conscience is a legitimate development of this nature, it may be regarded as a

divine utterance, — the voice of God speaking in and through our moral nature. Disobedience, therefore, becomes not merely an offence against conscience; it is also an offence against God, bringing us under the judgment of God.”

His doctrine in regard to the relation of individual conscience and public opinion has been greatly misapprehended. He says: —

“Public opinion resting on a direct appeal to common-sense and the moral sentiment is generally right. At any rate, it is more likely to be so, than the private opinion of interested prejudice. Look back on the history of human progress: almost every important step has been taken, not because the *few* advised it, but because the *many* demanded it. The history of reform in most centuries is little else than the history of a series of concessions to public opinion. . . . With ordinary men, and in the ordinary course of things, what we call the individual conscience is little else than a reflection of the public conscience, that is to say, of the public opinion of right; in such cases, therefore, the appeal to the public opinion of right is not necessarily an appeal from conscience to some other standard, — to that of expediency, for example: it may be, and often is, an appeal from the uninstructed conscience of the individual to what is believed to be the better instructed conscience of the community, or public sense of right. . . . Imperfect as public opinion is, there is not one man in ten thousand whom the fear of offending it does not make more circumspect, in many respects, than he otherwise would be; more anxious, not merely to appear, but also to be worthy of public confidence. . . . No sane man ever did, or ever will, live in society and yet be wholly indifferent to the opinion of society. For however much he may be at issue with society on some point, he is never at issue with it in such a sense as to have cast off all regard to appearances. . . . So profound is my reverence for the will of the people, or of even a majority of the people, that could I be sure it has been expressed freely and understandingly, I should hardly hesitate in any respect to obey; but I must have better evidence that the people will it than the reiterated and passionate assertions of zealots or demagogues, assuming to speak in their name. . . . Narrow-minded men may suspect and charge one at least of the parties to any contest with acting against what they see to be right; but it is much more reasonable as well as much more fair and magnanimous to suppose that neither party is in a condition to see what is right in the particular question. . . . Take away what early education has done, and what mere authority has done, and what sympathy and imitation have done, and what party spirit and party drill have done, and what addresses to the feelings and especially to men’s fears

and jealousies have done, — and what is there left? . . . Happily in almost every community making the smallest pretences to intelligence and freedom, there is a powerful reserve of moderate and silent men, who seldom cause themselves to be heard or felt in public matters, and yet are known to exist, and by creating a fear of reaction operate as a check on violent and headlong counsels. . . . I hold, therefore, that in making up our minds as to what public opinion enjoins or forbids, we are not to look to the writers and talkers alone, but are to take into account that powerful reserve of moderate and for the most part silent men, on whom, as I believe, in great and trying emergencies God has made the order and stability of society in no small measure to depend. Truth and justice, as it seems to me, demand this at our hands. Besides, were we always disposed to take this course, I need not say how much it would do to save both Church and State from these panics and violent disorders and convulsions which have done so much, and are likely to do so much more, to trouble and retard the progress of humanity and civilization.”

Of these “moderate and silent men,” James Walker deserves to be considered one. Still, he was a reformer in his way. Though he preached against “ultraism,” and said, “I make one rule, not to preach about anything until they have done talking about it in the omnibus,” he did speak strong words on the subject of temperance; he did demand of students that they should exclude the profligate from good society; he did condemn the theatres of his day; and in his address delivered at Cambridge in 1863 on “The Duties of Educated Men to the Country,” he uttered as warm words about patriotism as any man could use.

He was always a philosopher in the sense of one who loves the highest wisdom. In his lectures on “The Philosophy of Religion,” he says:—

“One word on the principles and spirit of these lectures. By undertaking the defence of religion, do you expect, I may be asked, to convert a single unbeliever? It would be enough to say, in reply to this question, that I have nothing to do with unbelievers, I address myself to *you*. . . . Absurd and paradoxical as it may appear, it is yet, I suspect, a common thing for a man to live and die a sceptic merely because he is afraid to look into the subject lest it make him one. . . . A destructive criticism like Hume’s is not a philosophy; it is not even to lay the foundations of a philosophy; it is a manifesto against all philosophy; not by showing how things are to be explained, but by showing, or trying to show, that, logically speaking, nothing really exists to

be explained. Now, it is one thing to *explain*, and another to *explain away*. There was a time when the public persecuted innovators: but times have changed; now innovators persecute the public."

One who knew him long says:—

"I never knew a minister who out of the pulpit so well sustained the impression he made when in the pulpit."

He applied his philosophy to his own personal condition. He had two infirmities,—deafness and lameness. Referring to the former, he once said:—

"I suppose I lose more or less of the wisdom there is going, but I get rid of a vast deal of nonsense. A friend who thinks he has anything very good to say to me is generally willing to raise his voice."

To another friend who advised a new method of treatment for his lameness he playfully replied:—

"I dare say that it might be of service, but you know I am a little superstitious on this point. I am afraid that were I to get rid of this lameness I might have something worse. I have thought the whole thing over, and as long as a man at my time of life may expect some ailment or other, I have concluded that I would not change mine for any other that I can think of. I am used to this."

His last days were cheerful, quiet, and free from pain. He had no disease, and was confined to his bed for only one day. He was simply worn out, and died from weakness. His wife died, on June 13, 1868, at the age of seventy; and, as has been said, he had no children. He died Dec. 23, 1874; and among his last words were these: "I die in the faith in which I have lived. . . . How much better it is to pray than to philosophize about it!" The last hours immediately before he died were spent in an attitude of devotion, with uplifted eyes and folded hands. His feeling toward men was as simple and childlike as his feeling toward God. "I believe," he used to say, "that I do not leave an enemy in the world."